

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 001

TM 000 368

AUTHOR McCahon, David; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of Pittsburgh Teacher Corps Pre-Service Program - Fourth Cycle.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. School of Education.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Culturally Disadvantaged, Educational Objectives, Educational Opportunities, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Methods, *Preservice Education, *Program Evaluation, *Sensitivity Training, Teacher Behavior, *Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation, *Teacher Interns, Teacher Selection, Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

The purpose, methodology, limitations, program, and recommendations of this evaluation are carefully spelled out. The background, programs, intern selection procedures, and instructional consultant selection procedures, and responsibilities of the Pittsburgh Teacher Corps are described. A primary task was the preparation of a set of behavioral objectives which are listed and the number of interns who met the criteria during the pre-service session is indicated. Data was collected by means of the Instructional Consultant Checklist. Results from a Reactionnaire revealing participants reactions to, and the climate of the training sessions are reported. See TM 000 405 and TM 000 406 for descriptions of the instruments mentioned. (CK)

ED0 47001

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF PITTSBURGH TEACHER CORPS
PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM - FOURTH CYCLE

June 25 - August 31, 1969

OFFICE OF RESEARCH
AND
FIELD SERVICES

TM 000 368
TM 000 405
TM 000 406

The Federal of Learning University of Pittsburgh

EVALUATION OF PITTSBURGH TEACHER CORPS

PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM - FOURTH CYCLE

June 25 - August 31, 1969

Office of Research and Field Services
Room 2901 Cathedral of Learning
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. James Mauch, Director
Mr. David McCahon, Principal Evaluator
Assisted by Mr. John Drugo
Mr. Andrew Pawlik

Telephone: 412:621-3500
extension 6487



PREFACE

This is a report of the evaluation of the pre-service portion of the 4th Cycle Teacher Corps Program at the University of Pittsburgh. The 4th Cycle Program extends through two years, including the 1969-70 and 1970-71 academic years. The pre-service portion consists of the first summer of the two-year cycle--in this case, the summer of 1969.

The principal evaluator was Dave McCahon, who was on the staff of the Office of Research and Field Services during the period of the pre-service evaluation. John Drugo and Andy Pawlik of the staff also contributed significantly to the work, and the enterprise was carried out under the direction of James Mauch, director of the Office.

The cooperation of the members of the Teacher Corps, and specifically the help of Marion Poole, the director, is sincerely appreciated. Their assistance made this evaluation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Evaluation	1
B. Methodology	2
C. Limitations	4
D. Program Abstract	5
E. Recommendations of the Pre-service Evaluation . . .	7

SECTION II: PITTSBURGH TEACHER CORPS

A. Models, Theories and Assumptions	10
B. Program Description	11
C. Pre-service Program Description	12
D. Intern Selection Procedures	16
E. Instructional Consultant Selection Procedures and Responsibilities	17

SECTION III: PRE-SERVICE EVALUATION

A. Introduction	20
B. Program Objectives, Criteria for Measuring Those Objectives and Source of Information	22
C. Community Reaction	30
D. Actual Program Procedures: 1. Screening Instructional Consultants	31
2. Screening Interns	32
E. Intercultural Training Workshop	33
F. Curriculum	38
G. Management Problems	38

SECTION IV: SUMMARY 40

APPENDICES 43

BIBLIOGRAPHY 52

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The commitment of the University of Pittsburgh's School of Education to design and develop in the urban areas the best education of which this nation is capable is a real and lasting commitment. It was a principal motivating factor for the submission of the original proposal for a Teacher Corps training center at the University, and it remains the principal motivating factor in everything the school does today. Nothing is more natural than for the School of Education to look to the experimental programs of the Teacher Corps to help point the direction for the training of teachers to meet the challenges of urban education.

The evaluation of the Teacher Corps was designed to facilitate this process. The purposes intended were:

1. To provide timely, consistent and continual feedback to Teacher Corps administration during the program operation phase which would facilitate immediate program improvement.
2. To provide information, data and judgments which would assist the School of Education in its delivery of services to urban education.
3. To publish periodic reports--of which this is one--making the evaluation available to a wide audience and providing a permanent record of the challenges and achievements of the Teacher Corps at the University of Pittsburgh.

B. METHODOLOGY

The research effort had several distinct phases which provided the basis for the analysis and evaluation.

1. Determination of Objectives: This phase consisted of defining objectives which were clearer, more precise, and more subject to evaluation than the original proposal objectives. A substantial part of the eight-week summer was spent in working with Teacher Corps leadership to try to define the objectives of the program and to suggest process of evaluation.
2. Evaluation Design: Determination of appropriate evaluation design for the two-year task was the second phase of the summer evaluation effort. This phase was not completed during the pre-service session.
3. Literature Search: This phase included a search of available literature from school officials, University memos and other documents describing the National Teacher Corps. Library catalog indices to periodic literature and the Office of Education helped greatly in identifying literature on the national level. Some of this material is compiled in the Bibliography at the end of the report.
4. Document Search: This phase consisted of a review of relevant policies, procedures and reports, including concept papers, early evaluations and proposals supplied by the Teacher Corps. The documentation provided valuable information on the operation of the local Teacher Corps.
5. Interviews: Here the research was interested in gaining greater insight into the Teacher Corps, and in further clarifying the roles and relationships of the administration, interns, instructional consultants, principals and students. This phase supplied many of the insights which could be gained in no other way.
6. Observation: Many of the inferences and recommendations are based on observations of the principal evaluator, checked with others by means of interviews, documents and questionnaires. The principal evaluator attended screening meetings, visited schools and principals and interviewed interns and instructional consultants.
7. Questionnaires: These consisted of instruments administered to trainers and instructional consultants designed to get specific and detailed information on a consistent basis.

The evaluation procedures used in pre-service were predicated upon three assumptions:

- a. that specific behavioral objectives were needed for all phases of the program before an evaluation could be made;
- b. that base line data would be needed to assess changes in the interns over the two-year period; and
- c. that the evaluation of any training program must include descriptions of what the trainees did and what was done to them in order to compare the planned and actual programs during subsequent program evaluation.

To obtain the behavioral objectives, we obtained the opinions of the Teacher Corps staff. The objectives relative to pre-service were then used as a base for the preparation of an Instructional Consultant Checklist. This instrument, discussions with the administrative and clerical staff of Teacher Corps, interviews with school principals, and discussions with groups of interns were used to assess the pre-service objectives.

It was decided to use three instruments as base line data since they would cover many of the behavioral areas considered important in this training program. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was selected as a measure of education attitude change. The National Teacher Exam was selected in order to compare interns with other samples as well as their own progress. The Edwards Attitude Inventory was selected as a means of measuring change on attitudes relevant to working with a culturally different population. (The administration of these instruments was begun during pre-service.)

The evaluator maintained constant contact with the pre-service program during the summer months through the following activities:

- a. Observation of the interns in their schools (50%), instructional consultants in their schools (6 of 8), Teacher Corps staff meetings (over 50%), selection and screening of I.C.'s (100%), and selection and screening of interns (100%).
- b. Informal interviews with residents (20) of the communities to be served during and after intern screening, public school personnel (5 principals and 3 administrators), interns (67%), instructional consultants (6 of 8), Teacher Corps administrators (all who worked during pre-service), and university instructors (4).
- c. Analysis of screening processes and the intercultural workshops.

These activities were carried out between June 25 and September 1, 1969.

C. LIMITATIONS

There were the usual general limitations of personnel, budget, time and materials. For example, during the pre-service phase of the evaluation there was one half-time evaluator, ten percent of the time of the office director, no secretarial time and no budget for materials or any other supplies.

Specific limitations of the study include:

1. Only the pre-service aspect of the Teacher Corps is included. Other aspects, including some of the contextual background, will be included in the in-service evaluation, which will be contained in a subsequent report.
2. Interview schedules and questionnaires were often not returned or filled out, despite several attempts to elicit the data. Conclusions then were based on less than total populations.
3. No attempt was made to evaluate the Urban Intern Program.

D. PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Teacher Corps was created by Title V-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It was designed primarily as a two-year teacher training program, and those who participated were to spend approximately one-third of their time interning in the public schools, one-third involved in various aspects of the communities surrounding their schools, and the final third working toward a Master's degree at a university. Teacher Corps programs were focused on the disadvantaged and it was a basic requirement that public school systems and universities work cooperatively to plan and operate such programs.

The primary objective of Teacher Corps was to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families. Secondary objectives of the program included the following: 1) the development of competent teachers who very probably would not have entered the field of education without the availability of the program; 2) to increase the number and quality of personnel available in disadvantaged schools; and 3) to demonstrate more effective methods of preparing teachers to work in disadvantaged schools through programs imaginatively designed by public school and university personnel working cooperatively.^{1,2}

The 4th Cycle Teacher Corps Program in Pittsburgh is a joint effort of three equal partners:

1. McKeesport Area School District
2. City of Pittsburgh Public Schools
3. University of Pittsburgh, School of Education

Almost one-half of the funding the interns receive for their support comes from monies paid to the University by the two local school districts.

The two districts reserved a total of 23 contractual positions for Teacher Corps interns (18 in Pittsburgh and 5 in McKeesport). These positions were reserved in teams in schools. In secondary schools two interns filled one position. Each team of interns is assisted by a full-time instructional consultant who plans with and assists the induction of each team of interns into teaching, related community experiences and University work. The instructional consultant holds a joint appointment with his school district and the University of Pittsburgh. There is usually one intern team per building.

Interns have reduced formal teaching loads as they move through the two years of their internship. They also take about 8 hours of University course work per term (52 hours total) over the two-year span of the program. This course work includes an initial pre-service program which is designed to give the intern sufficient experience with teaching and teaching methods to perform as an adequate teacher with the assistance of his instructional consultant—even during the first critical months of newness in a strange situation.

This model attempts to build flexibility when interns, for one or another reason, are deselected or deselect themselves from the program. Five interns in the elementary positions automatically allow for one deselection per team. The three parties to the agreement also provided that if a position became vacant either party would attempt to fill this within ten days. After this time, the respective Board of Education had the right to fill that position from its own sources, and was no longer obligated to hold it for Teacher Corps.

University Training Sequence in the Program

1. Pre-service Phase: Eight weeks total including sensitivity training; student teaching; special methods courses (elementary math and reading, secondary special field and reading); Urban Community course and field experiences including special seminars on microteaching, educational objectives, analysis of teaching, etc.
2. In-service Phase: This phase included responsible intern teaching; small group and tutoring experiences; individually negotiated contract courses designed to meet interns' teaching needs; regular University course work (professional and academic); and planned and coordinated community experiences.

The program expected that as interns gained experience and expertise they would become more heavily involved in community experiences, designed in consultation with others, which helped to build higher levels of skills in the community of which the school was a part. These community projects would be coordinated in each community as a team project.*

*This summary of the Pittsburgh Teacher Corps was prepared in May, 1970 for a Pittsburgh Teacher Corps booklet entitled "Teacher Corps/Urban Internship Program" published in May, 1970 by the University of Pittsburgh.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRE-SERVICE EVALUATION

1. Planning: All Teacher Corps staff (including an outside programmer-evaluator) should be on site a minimum of three weeks before the interns arrive to plan and coordinate the pre-service program. A set of behaviorally stated objectives should be developed by the entire staff before the interns arrive. When an intern reaches an objective, he should be counseled to expend his energies in other objective areas.
2. Screening: The screening of Teacher Corps staff would be greatly facilitated by briefing those doing the screening on the roles of those being screened. Design a realistic procedure for the selection of interns, and begin recruiting early enough to have all interns on site at the beginning of pre-service. Screening panels should be composed of all populations affected by the Teacher Corps (school officials; community members, including parents and students, University representatives, Teacher Corps staff and residents).
3. The major screening of interns should occur immediately after the sensitivity training, and be performed by people not involved in the sensitivity training.
4. The screening panels, which are basically a sound idea, must be better structured, with roles and responsibilities defined, advance information on candidates, a chance to discuss roles and candidates before and after meeting with them, and an opportunity for a more intensive evaluation of each person as a candidate.
5. The panel's work, when done in August of the pre-service, is almost an anachronism; and the high absenteeism may be one result of this observation. Certainly it is unfair to all sides, especially the candidate, to be screened so late. Program quality suffers because few screeners are willing to deselect a candidate at such a late date after a good deal of commitment on his part. The panel selection should ideally occur in the spring before pre-service, giving the Teacher Corps a chance at the best candidates before they are committed to another position.
6. While the screening panel for instructional consultants appeared to be very useful, it would be improved by better planned procedures which would allow the panel and the applicant to know each other much better.
7. A similar screening device could improve the selection of interns, giving the representatives of various groups a view of the intern before a selection decision is made. Although criteria will be different, there seems to be no good reason to make distinctions between instructional consultants and interns in the basic selection process.

8. Intercultural Training Workshop: The first week of pre-service should be devoted to orientation and sensitivity training. Both of these activities must have specific objectives to be meaningful. Early sensitivity training has these advantages:
 - a) less "noise" will be generated by intern sub-groups,
 - b) strictly random assignments to groups can be made, and
 - c) it will not appear to be a selection device.
9. Sensitivity training should be allotted enough time to complete its objectives. Do not fit sensitivity training into the residual time after all other activities are planned.
10. All objectives of this workshop were not, and probably could not have been, met by using one week-end at the end of the summer. These objectives would imply a strong need to start early; build in the counselor centrally so that he could continue the work throughout the summer.
11. Sensitivity training sessions must ultimately result in bringing people together, particularly if they must work closely together as in Teacher Corps teams. The organization of the workshop as projected by the proposal seems more likely to yield the desired results than what happened.
12. Ideally, the intercultural workshop of one week at the beginning should be followed, as envisioned by the proposal, with a shorter period of work near the end, when team assignments are made and personnel know where and with whom they are to work. That is the most propitious time to build a strong team with internal loyalty and commitment to facing the school's challenge.
13. Placement: Specific teams should be formed as early as possible to allow the interns to work out initial team adjustment problems during pre-service. Insofar as possible, interns should spend pre-service in the same schools they will be assigned to during the regular school year (or at least the same school system).
14. The principal of each school which is served by interns should have a positive attitude toward Teacher Corps and its objectives. He should have a chance to accept or decline participation, and should know before his summer vacation what will occur.
15. Pre-service should include an intensively supervised practicum which includes individual, small group and large group instruction. Each school should commit itself to provide such an experience before interns are placed there.

16. Interns and instructional consultants should be assigned to schools early in the pre-service, even if this means some later transfers. Only by an early identification with a school and its community can an intern or instructional consultant, during pre-service, develop that understanding and commitment to his community and children so clearly and correctly demanded by the proposals of the Teacher Corps.
17. The competence level necessary to begin teaching in a hard core school the first school day of September cannot be developed in one day. The lack of assignment meant, moreover, that there was no opportunity to build a team before school started; no opportunity to build the esprit de corps, to feel comfortable in one's school, to arrange one's classroom; no opportunity to know the community, the neighborhood, parents and children, or to learn to use the opportunities available in the community and school.
18. Program: Enough flexibility should be built into the program process to allow changes to occur based upon the various feedback mechanisms. Each intern should be required to participate in all phases of the program. The participation requirement is urged, also, to allow a full evaluation of the training at a later date through intern feedback.
19. All subject seminars in pre-service should place first priority on instruction in handling the learning problems of students (i.e., how to teach reading in the reading seminar).
20. Management: Prolonged absence from pre-service should be kept at an absolute minimum by both staff and interns to insure maximum adjustment of interns and staff prior to in-service.

II. PITTSBURGH TEACHER CORPS

A. MODELS, THEORIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

The 4th Cycle Teacher Corps Proposal at the University of Pittsburgh was based largely upon a model proposed by Wilson³ and Champagne⁴ in their doctoral dissertations at the University. Their model proposed an extended internship/residency program following an intensive, structured, carefully supervised eight-week pre-service program. This preparation program was based upon the following assumptions quoted from the original proposal⁵:

1. The extended internship shall include responsibilities substantially less than those given most beginning teachers.
2. Continuing on-site consultant help from experienced specially trained professionals in the area of curriculum content, instructional methods, communication and community.
3. The pre-service training period shall include an intensively supervised practicum. During this time the teacher trainee will not be the teacher of record. His schedule will include individual, small group and large group instruction.
4. During both the pre- and in-service phases of the teacher preparation, there shall be regular community experiences structured by the program and community at first to teach the trainee some aspects of the culture of the community, then structured by the trainee with the advice and consent of the community as an educational service to the community.
5. That the program of each teacher trainee will be planned individually with him in order to meet his individual and program competence levels.
6. A teacher training program should produce teachers who are effective agents of improvement within the system in which they are practicing professionals.
7. The extended internship shall be served in carefully selected educational centers where administrators, faculty and community have chosen to be a part of this project. These centers shall exemplify the best of educational practice, and acceptance and encouragement of educational change.

8. No educational center shall be used which in the opinion of the Board of Education, faculty, administrators, community, or university, represents maximum stress factors, no matter how many criteria that center may meet.

The 4th Cycle proposal clearly assumed that there were too few qualified and employed black teachers. This was the reason for the firm commitment to recruit at least 50% of the incoming interns from among black college graduates, even if this meant using the national recruitment service of the Teacher Corps in Washington, D. C.

This assumption was based on the fact that black teachers in the schools and black students in the School of Education did not approach that of the percentage of black students in the schools of the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. That black and white pupils in our public schools must see a positive black image with which they have daily contact was, and still remains, an article of faith to the Pittsburgh Teacher Corps, and a keystone upon which the whole program was to be built.⁶

B. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 4th Cycle Teacher Corps Program was a joint proposal of the University of Pittsburgh, the Board of Public Education of Pittsburgh and the Board of Public Education of McKeesport, Pennsylvania. The two public school districts originally committed themselves to a total of 30 locally funded contractual positions. Eighteen of these were in Pittsburgh (6 secondary and 12 elementary); the remaining 12 in McKeesport (6 secondary and 6 elementary).

The participants in this program were initially designated as urban interns. They were so designated to show source of funding and to emphasize that they were not supplemental teachers. They were taking regular teacher positions.

However, for each urban intern position the program added a federally funded Teacher Corps intern so that during the program each intern could have a one-half time teaching load.⁷

The current model is a departure from the previous Urban Intern Program (1968-69). The urban interns taught essentially full teaching schedules, with little time to do community work, quality university work, and with no on-the-job training time to learn about teaching in a rational way.⁸

In the judgment of the Pittsburgh Teacher Corps, the 1968-69 Urban Internship Program resulted in low morale, slow growth of interns' teaching competencies and less desirable educational situations for pupils. The 4th Cycle Proposal called for a program of 68 interns and 11 instructional consultants (team leaders) to work together in teams of six. Each team would have 3 Teacher Corps interns and be led by an instructional consultant. One team per building was expected to occupy three contractual positions.

The proposal preserved the Teacher Corps model, i.e., the team concept, reduced loads, meaningful community involvement, time for University work, time to learn teaching by planning, and experience under supervision with tutoring, small group and large group instruction. The interns were expected to do responsible teaching from the first day of their in-service program. This responsible teaching, according to the proposal, would take place only after an intensive summer pre-service program which included large doses of student teaching and method/theory courses in addition to an orientation and introduction to the community.

C. PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

According to the proposal, the eight-week pre-service program was to commence with five days of orientation and sensitivity training. This was to be followed by six full weeks of half-time student teaching. Planning and diagnostic skill development, method courses, community orientation, and development of a commitment to the instructional team would occupy the remaining portion of the candidates' time during this pre-service period. Second-year interns were to participate in the program as course assistants. The final week of pre-service was planned to draw together the threads of the summer experiences for each intern, including some further sensitivity training and individual summary by and with each intern of his total profile as a teacher to that date.

The major objectives of the pre-service program were to identify, select, reinforce interns who:


- a. Develop enough self-awareness of language patterns, behavior, and attitudes so that they begin to build effective relationships with colleagues, kids and superiors of either racial group they serve as teachers.
- b. Care enough about children to guide them toward increased learning levels.

c. Understand that a school serves a community and believe that a teacher is a full member of that community. Then act on this belief by reaching out to form supportive relationships with members of that community.

d. Begin a self-analytic process about the skills and competencies one needs to develop as a teacher. This analysis will be demonstrated by intern ability in accurately identifying areas of major strength and weakness as a teacher.

e. Use the opportunities available in the community, school and university experiences to attain a level of competence necessary for responsible and effective beginning teaching during the 1969 school year. ¹¹

The following flow chart shows the design of the eight-week pre-service program as envisioned by the proposal: ¹²



Phase 1 was planned as a five-day Intercultural Training experience by a mixed group of black and white trainers. These trainers were hired in a ratio of two to a group of 10-12 interns and residents in the program. The summer was not intended to be a screening device by the directors of the program. Some self-deselection by the interns was, however, not unexpected as a result of the sensitivity training experience.

The general objectives of Phase 1 are those listed in (a) above. The objective of the intercultural workshop was to establish an open, trusting atmosphere where the participants could verbalize their prejudices, feelings and thinking, especially about racial issues and teaching. Phase 1 was also to contain several general orientation sessions about the program.¹³

Phase 2-The six-week student teaching, community seminar, reading and arithmetic methods seminars were the heart of the summer pre-service program for interns. The proposal assumed that the first skills the interns would be called upon to demonstrate in the fall in-service program were reading and mathematic teaching skills. Therefore, the summer program was designed as a preparation for these two content areas.¹⁴

The goal of the community course during the summer was one of information and education for the interns. It was not service to the community except as this may occur incidentally. The afternoon and evening devoted to this task was to be a very intensive one carefully planned by the instructors.¹⁵

The faculty of this course was to consist of persons recommended by community organizations. Several Urban Intern Residents were to serve as course assistants, and were expected to share their year's experience with the interns. "The Urban Context," El. Ed. 244 was already in the School of Education bulletin, taught by a community resource person.¹⁶

The proposal indicated that student teaching would be structured so that the prospective intern would learn to tutor individual pupils, to teach small groups, and to organize and teach classroom size groups under careful supervision.

"The instructional faculty for this part of the interns' experience will be the instructional consultant staff and the program directors. Several residents will be attached to this part of the program, and will serve as extra faculty under the supervision of instructional consultants.

Student teachers will work generally in teams in the room or rooms of cooperating teachers. One period each morning will be spent in examination of the experiences of the interns. The program faculty will prepare the interns to observe classroom activities while it occurs, then to make inferences about behaviors viewed and finally to plan strategies that might be appropriate to deal with each situation."¹⁷

Weeks one through six of the summer teaching sequence and seminars were to be sequential experiences beginning with observations and informal tutoring and ending with a variety of experiences, where the intern has increased responsibility for the whole group instruction.¹⁸

Two afternoons per week, the interns were to take individual special methods courses. For secondary students this meant either a math, a science, an English, reading or social studies methods seminar. (The needs of the school district here determined the recruitment of interns and thus which methods courses will be offered.) For elementary interns this meant a reading seminar.¹⁹

The fourth afternoon of the elementary interns was planned as an arithmetic methods seminar. For the secondary interns a special seminar on the diagnosis and treatment of common reading problems of pupils in the secondary school was scheduled because many of the secondary pupils which interns will teach have several reading problems.²⁰

At the end of the summer phase of the program final deselection of interns who had not reached a minimum level of performance was to be completed. This deselection process began as early as the second week of pre-service when the first formal evaluation conferences were held with each intern. Intern deselection was based on recommendations of residents, instructional consultants, program faculty, community observations, classroom performance and intern growth. The Teacher Corps leadership felt that deselection was best done at this time.²¹

Phase 3-The eighth and final week for interns was to be very unstructured, but with a very structured product expected from it. The interns were to be asked to assess where they were as teachers in very specific terms and decide what they need next in their training. Then they were to write a very detailed work contract including specific performance criteria to be reached at its completion for the period of the first half of the approaching University term. This contract was to be drawn with the advice and approval of the intern's advisor.²²

The proposal stated that secondary team formation and school determination would be largely determined by the subject specialty of the interns and instructional consultants. Elementary team formation and school determination would be determined by sociometric choice. This method, used in Pittsburgh for the first two cycles, has worked very well, in the opinion of the Teacher Corps leadership.²³

One-week staff planning and orientation of the program prior to the beginning of the pre-service program for interns was proposed. Program faculty, instructional consultants, community workers, program evaluators and Urban Intern Program residents were to attend this session. The intercultural training group leaders were to be hired during the last two days of this pre-week to complete their design and plans for the first week's intercultural training (Phase 1) of the pre-service program. Several days of this time were also to be used with the instructional consultant group to begin their supervisory training sessions.²⁴

D. INTERN SELECTION PROCEDURES

The proposal stated that the selection procedures were to be carried out in the following five phases:

1. The prospective intern will submit a completed University of Pittsburgh application for admission to Graduate Study in Education, a completed Teacher Corps application form and three letters of recommendation, one focusing on the candidate's academic qualifications, one focusing on the candidate's personal qualifications, and one focusing on the candidate's demonstrated commitment to education or community service. These documents will be evaluated by the University and Teacher Corps staff in terms of general academic and personal qualifications as well as evidence of commitment to education. Those candidates who are deemed satisfactory will enter into the second phase of the procedure.

2. The candidates will be mailed a set of case materials. These materials will present them with problems of the type they will be facing as Teacher Corps interns. They will be asked to describe how they would react to these situations as Teacher Corps interns.

The candidate will be asked to write a short autobiography describing those incidents in his life which led to his interest in and application to the Teacher Corps Program. The autobiography and response to case materials will be evaluated by University Teacher Corps personnel in terms of the individual's present level of sensitivity to the type of situation he will be facing, and evidence these materials present of the candidate's potential for growth. Those candidates satisfactorily completing this phase will go to Phase 3.

3. Each intern will be invited to the Pitt campus and the two school districts. He will spend a day with experienced interns in the school if possible and will be interviewed by a panel consisting of the program directors, experienced interns, instructional consultants, public school coordinators and representatives of the black community, e.g. (The Forever Action Together (F.A.T.) education committee has already promised to serve on such a panel). Candidates who pass this phase will go to Phase 4.

4. Candidates will be presented to the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education for screening of interns in the school system.

5. Final acceptance will be contingent on college graduation by the candidate. (In the event a candidate does not fulfill a specific University of Pittsburgh requirement for admission to Graduate Study, such a requirement may be waived at the discretion of the University Admissions Office.) ²⁵

E. INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The instructional consultant was seen by the proposal as the key to the ongoing success of the program. The Teacher Corps leadership saw that in the past the major weakness of the program was the selection of inexperienced and untrained instructional consultants; almost all of the continuing crises in the past could have been avoided with strong, experienced leaders in the schools. This mistake was not to be repeated in the 4th Cycle. To be sure that the program succeeds, the following criteria were agreed on by the schools and the University:

1. 3-5 year experience in educating the children of the poor.
2. The academic qualifications and interest in working successfully at the doctoral level in the field of curriculum and supervision.

3. Evidence of some previous interest and success of the instructional consultant in duties beyond day-to-day teaching responsibilities, e.g., as a cooperating teacher, teaching adult education, working on curriculum groups, etc.

4. Evidence of a commitment to the broader community on the instructional consultant's own time.

5. Evidence that the person is seeking career advancement and evidence that he is questioning elements of the system in which he works.²⁶

Procedures for selecting instructional consultants were to be similar although more rigorous than those procedures for selecting interns. Again, the minimum goal for instructional consultants was that 50% of them be black men.

The responsibilities of instructional consultants include:

1. Must form working, productive teams from separate individuals.

2. Must carry out planned, careful supervision of the team of interns.

3. Must focus and coordinate a useful community project of the team.

4. Must serve as program faculty in methods and curriculum experiences during the pre-service program and the in-service program (with the contract system this role becomes even more important).

5. Must grow in stature and training as a change agent during their time with Teacher Corps and after they leave Teacher Corps.²⁷

Also the proposal indicated that the following procedures would be rigorously applied to the screening of instructional consultants:

1. Filing of University and Teacher Corps application forms.

2. Completion of a vita and a structured autobiography which will show motivation, and some significant experiences that shaped this motivation.

3. Completion of simulated case material which will test the applicants thinking in a school-supervisory situation and in a school community situation. These materials will be judged for number and quality of alternative solutions proposed, depth of analysis of the problem, degree of risk consultant proposes to take, and their assessment of the many factors involved in selecting an appropriate strategy.

4. In depth screening interviews by University personnel (including interns, present instructional consultants, faculty), by community panels who have a veto power over applicants, and by school personnel as designated by the Board personnel office.²⁸

It became increasingly clear to the Teacher Corps leadership that simply having teaching experience was not adequate training for trainers of teachers. Trainers of teachers must themselves have formal continuing experiences of both a practical and theoretical nature in supervision, human relations, community and school curriculum work.²⁹

For this Teacher Corps program, three days of the pre-week of the pre-service program began the formal training of the new instructional consultants in supervision. This was a structured seminar built around the theory of clinical supervision, employing role playing, video taping, self-instruction packages (Flander's Interaction Analysis Kits), self-evaluation materials, etc.

In the final follow-up week of the pre-service program instructional consultants were to draw up contracts similar to those for the interns. These contracts would detail the directions of training for the instructional consultant.³⁰

III. PRE-SERVICE EVALUATION

One of the primary tasks of the pre-service evaluation was to prepare a set of behavioral objectives for the 4th Cycle. The first phase of this time-consuming task consisted of compiling lists of statements which could be construed as objectives. The sources for these statements were the Cycle IV Proposal, statements of "behavior areas" prepared by the local Teacher Corps staff, and national Teacher Corps publications (see Bibliography).

These statements were then submitted to a panel consisting of Teacher Corps administrators, a research consultant, and members of the evaluation staff. This panel selected the most relevant objectives from the prepared list and suggested criteria for the measurement of their attainment. The panel also devoted its attention to anticipating operational difficulties in the measurement of objectives and questioning the reliability and validity of the measuring devices discussed.

At the conclusion of these meetings, a draft of the objectives was prepared and presented to the instructional consultants in order that their feedback be incorporated in the objectives. It was felt that the instructional consultants, as the principal evaluators of intern on-the-job behavior, ought to review any instrument suggested for their use. There was little or no feedback from the instructional consultants at a meeting one week after the objectives had been distributed. At the meeting, a representative of the interns pointed out that these objectives had not been submitted to the interns, and arrangements were made to discuss the draft objectives with all the interns during the following week.

Less than one-third of the interns were present for the planned discussion of the objectives. Those who were present were primarily concerned with the procedures of evaluation and the leverage that evaluation activity could offer them. There was no feedback concerning the proposed objectives. There was an interest in assuring the reliability of all measures of intern behavior through the use of alternative means of measurement. The undercurrent of this discussion centered on utilization of more than the opinions of the instructional consultants in the assessment of intern behavior.

The objectives have remained unchanged since the conclusion of the panel meetings. They were regrouped as a result of the combined feedback of all who read and reacted to the length of the document. The regrouping is an attempt to isolate separate areas of behavior for ease of access to the list.

Going through the time-consuming, and at times difficult, process of defining the objectives of the Teacher Corps as behaviorally as possible seemed necessary in order to bring the global objectives, goals and hopes down to the level of specificity necessary for understanding and at least some measure of agreement. A global objective like (from the proposal) "care enough about children to guide them toward increased learning levels"³¹ is worthwhile and appropriate for the prose of proposals and legislation. A program of action, a design of processes and a blueprint of evaluation need more precise language so that it can be understood, so that personnel know what the expectations are, so that progress toward the objectives can be judged by some yardstick and so that, at the end, one may determine to what extent the stated goals are related to the outcome.

Having stated this, it is also important to state that the important aspects of the impact of a program cannot always be judged in light of previously stated objectives, regardless of how behaviorally they may be stated. Therefore, the evaluators felt the process and outcome of initially focusing on objectives was an essential, but not sufficient activity of evaluation in the earliest stages.

It should also be made clear that these objectives were used as reference points for continual feedback from evaluators to program management. They were not used primarily as standards for after-the-fact judgments of program achievements.

The objectives are presented below. Each objective is paired with a block which includes an assessment of its attainment during pre-service and the primary source used in the assessment. The I. C. (instructional consultant) Checklist referred to below may be found in the Appendix I

The primary source of the data presented was the Instructional Consultant Checklist. This instrument was prepared to elicit inputs from the instructional consultants — they were assumed to be in the best positions to observe intern behavior. Those objectives which specified instructional consultant inputs were phrased to allow responses of "always," "most of the time," "some of the time," and "never." The instructional consultants were asked to complete one list for each of the interns they were working with and, at the same time, to critique the instrument. Two instructional consultants commented on the checklist, and twenty-two completed lists were returned by four instructional consultants.

OBJECTIVES, CRITERIA AND SOURCE
4th CYCLE TEACHER CORPS

Table I

I. Interns' Perception of Self

- A. Interns and residents (second year Teacher Corps interns) will develop an acute self-awareness of goals, needs and ability (criteria and measures to be established in conjunction with Teacher Corps Counselor); such as:

1. Interns will indicate a preference for grade level and subject before end of pre-service.

100% attainment

Source: Teacher Corps
Administration

2. Interns and residents exhibit little defensive behavior in their relations with instructional consultants and supervisors, supply alternative suggestions for problem solutions when rejecting recommended courses of action ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

91% "never" or "some- Source: I.C. Checklist
times" exhibit defensive
behavior

67% offer alternatives Source: I.C. Checklist

II. General Objectives

A. Racial Balance

1. To recruit black teachers for the Pittsburgh-McKeesport schools (high percentage -- 50% of interns should be black).

33% black (9/1969)

Source: Teacher Corps
Management

B. During Program Tenure

1. Interns and residents will be able to recognize communication problems (person to person) and differing perceptions of an issue ("most of the time" as judged by the instructional consultant).

Student-Student 77% met criteria	Source: I.C. Checklist
Intern-Student 50% met criteria	Source: I.C. Checklist
Intern-Intern 84% met criteria	Source: I.C. Checklist
Intern-Instructional Consultant 75% met criteria	Source: I.C. Checklist
Intern-School Staff	Source: I.C. Checklist School Principals
Intern-Community Members not enough observation	Source: I.C. Checklist

2. Interns and residents will discover a "sense of fulfillment" in their Teacher Corps activities ("most of the time" as measured by interviews with interns and residents and instructional consultant perception).

64% met criteria -- Source: I.C. Checklist
high correlation noted Intern discussions
between meeting criteria
and having freedom of
action in classrooms

3. The interns and residents will "survive in the classroom." attrition during each term)

objective for In-Service Evaluation

C. Upon Completion of Program

1. The residents' commitment to local education is high (100% of the residents will seek employment in the schools of the community in which they have been trained).

objective for Post-Service Evaluation

2. Produce teachers who are effective agents of improvement in the school system in which they work (to be assessed after the two-year Teacher Corps experience).

objective for Post-Service Evaluation

III. Interns' Classroom Behavior

A. General Classroom Setting

1. Interns and residents are committed to imaginative service to children in poverty areas (intern or resident will depict himself as a teacher who attempts to utilize new concepts of curriculum, organization, etc., when they are appropriate).

Not assessed in In-service evaluation

2. Interns and residents care enough about all students to guide them toward increased learning levels (measured by T. B. Edwards' "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation" and MTAI, and interviews with parents, principals and instructional consultants).

In-service assessment

3. Interns and residents will establish and maintain a "learning atmosphere" in their classrooms (parents, students, regular faculty, principals, and instructional consultants describe the classroom atmosphere as positively productive for the students).

Objective for In-service assessment

4. Interns and residents will utilize their community knowledge in the classroom ("most of the time" as judged by the instructional consultant).

Objective for In-service assessment. Interns had no organized community projects and did not know what communities they would be in during pre-service.

5. Interns and residents use acceptably at least one general teaching mode. This mode is appropriate to their classroom setting (judged by their instructional consultant).

100% of interns have at least one teaching mode Source: I.C. Checklist

58% of these modes are appropriate Source: I.C. Checklist

6. Interns and residents will show skill and mastery in the use of basic teaching techniques ("most of the time" as judged by the instructional consultant).

Objective for In-service Evaluation

B. Intern-Student Interaction

1. Interns and residents interact with students in an adult-student manner, not peer ("always" as judged by instructional consultant).

31% of interns met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

2. Interns and residents are fair and consistent in their relations with students ("always" as judged by students).

Objective for In-service Evaluation

3. Interns and residents do not use conflicting verbal and non-verbal signals in the classroom ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

All interns met the criteria of "never" or "sometimes" using conflicting verbal and non-verbal signals in the classroom. Source: I.C. Checklist

C. Classroom Planning

1. Learning sequences are planned before class begins ("most of the time" as judged by an instructional consultant).

100% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

2. Learning sequences are planned for more than one day segments ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

55% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

3. Learning sequences are related to the expressed goals of the interns and residents for that lesson ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

Objective for In-service Evaluation

4. Learning sequences have specific goals for students ("always" as judged by the instructional consultants).

36% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

5. Interns and residents anticipate learning difficulties ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

60% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

D. Classroom Control

1. Students start task behavior upon cue from interns or residents ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

100% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

2. Interns and residents reinforce task behavior ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

77% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

3. Interns and residents ignore or quietly stop off-task behavior ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

33% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

4. Interns and residents anticipate digressive or disruptive student behavior ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

53% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

5. Interns and residents do not lose portions of their classes in unproductive behavior ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

14 of 22 interns met Source: I.C. Checklist
criteria of "never" or
"sometimes"

8 of 22 interns were Source: I.C. Checklist
not observed enough for
evaluation of this
objective

E. Classroom Routines

1. Interns and residents have established regular routines in the classroom and expected student behavior patterns are clear to students (student behavior in the classroom and student perceptions).

Objective for In-service Evaluation

2. All students participate in the lesson procedures ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

65% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

3. Students attend to those participating in the classroom activities while they are not actually participating in the class situation ("most of the time" as judged by instructional consultant).

50% met criteria Source: I.C. Checklist

4. Resources such as book, films, dittos, etc. are appropriate to classroom objectives and are ready when needed ("always" as judged by instructional consultant).

30% met criteria for Source: I.C. Checklist
"appropriateness"

50% met "ready" Source: I.C. Checklist
criteria

IV. Community Commitment

- A. The intern and resident will understand that a school serves a community, and believe that a teacher is a full member of that community (community's assessment of intern and resident interaction with the community).
- B. Interns and residents will be conscious of cultural differences in their school and community (as judged by the community and instructional consultants).
- C. Interns develop community projects which make a contribution to pupil education, school community relations, or community development (community's assessment of the contribution made by the project). Residents will maintain their community projects during the mid-service phase of training (100% of those projects found acceptable by the community, by count).
- D. Residents will maintain and expand their school-related community projects during the in-service phase (100% of those projects found acceptable by the community, by count).

All of above items A, B, C and D are Objectives for In-service Evaluation.

V. Interns' Knowledge of School and University

A. School Procedure and Personnel

- 1. Interns and residents are able to state what content and processes are generally taught at grade levels in their buildings (elementary -- all grades, all subjects; secondary -- all grades in subject taught).
- 2. Interns and residents are acquainted with the facilities of their assigned buildings, know the skills and responsibilities of other school personnel, and know what groups of staff and students they are responsible to (the chief administrator in the school sets the criteria for assessment).

B. School Regulation

1. Interns and residents can verbalize the regulations of this school in regard to his own absences, his schedule, attendance forms, meetings, etc. (the set verbalized is similar to the set verbalized by the chief administrator in the school).
2. Interns and residents accept and follow school regulations, even while using environmentally appropriate means to improve these regulations ("most of the time" as judged by the chief administrator of the school).

All of the above items A and B are Objectives for In-service Evaluation.

C. University

1. Interns and residents can state the University's role in their program and building, the financial and other relationships between their school system and the University, and the regulations regarding registration at the University.

Objective for In-service Evaluation

Since the interns in pre-service were not teaching in their own regular classrooms, some of the behavior described in the checklist was not observed during the pre-service session, but will be observed during the in-service sessions, e.g. Part III Classroom Behavior.

The other two major sources used were open-ended interviews conducted by the evaluator with interns and principals. During the pre-service phase, the evaluation staff did discuss such matters as program procedures and objective attainment with more than twenty individual interns. The interviews with the principals were designed to elicit information on the rationale for school selection, intern roles in the schools, and faculty reaction to the interns. The results of these interviews are reflected in Table I (above) and the "Actual Program Procedures" section (below).

The Teacher Corps is an innovative, experimental program which operated at the University of Pittsburgh in the way most such programs operate — it was not bound by tradition or by its own projections contained in the proposal. The management made changes where it felt changes were necessary, almost on a daily basis, particularly during the pre-service phase when everyone was new,

including management. In other words, the pre-service Teacher Corps was not installed as planned.

This mode of operation presents certain hazards to the more traditional evaluation methods and designs. It makes it difficult, for example, to describe the program. The program is constantly changing, and not always is it apparent how or why. Traditional experimental design type of evaluation seeks to prevent rather than adjust to or facilitate program changes.

The Pre-service evaluation responded by accepting and describing changes as part of the evaluation process. After all, the important thing for the program was not whether it departed from what management projected in its proposal, but how it departed and the effects such departures seemed to have on the quality of the program.*

Community Reaction

There was no time to make a systematic attempt to gather data which would indicate community evaluation of the Teacher Corps. Furthermore, the Pittsburgh communities couldn't be expected to have much to evaluate in the 4th Cycle Teacher Corps.

Nevertheless, the evaluator did listen to the community people picked for screening panels by Teacher Corps, and did talk with parents in several communities. Their reactions to Teacher Corps were based on past history — their view of the success of earlier cycles, not of the present cycle. There generally were two areas of concern among community people. They note:

"the slow growth of teaching competencies and less desirable educational situations for the kids"³² but do not place responsibility for this with the model. They feel that the selection procedures need improvement through greater community participation in original selection of the potential interns. The second concern revolves around the quality of education that the interns can provide for their children. Each community wishes to have the best teachers for its children, and these parents question whether novice teachers in two-year cycles can provide this "best" education.

A systematic attempt to gather community views of the current 4th Cycle Teacher Corps is a part of the evaluation design and is being conducted in the first year of in-service.

* See Daniel Stufflebeam for a good exposition of this point in Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making, 1968: Evaluation Center, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Actual Program Procedures

The three major aspects investigated were the screening and selection of interns and consultants, the intercultural training workshop, and the implementation of the curriculum.

Screening: Instructional Consultants

This process calls for "in-depth screening interviews by school personnel, the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education, University personnel (including interns, present instructional consultants and faculty) and community panels." 33

A screening panel was convened on June 19, 1969 to screen the instructional consultant applicants and the counselor applicant. The panel was composed of public school personnel (including two principals), community residents, Teacher Corps interns, incumbent instructional consultants and Teacher Corps administrators.

The panel sat in a large room and the applicants came in one at a time. The basic procedure was an introduction by the Teacher Corps Director (moderator) followed by fifteen minutes of questions from the panel. The applicants did not know the role of the questioner when answering questions unless he (the applicant) asked for that information.

The questions raised by the panel were noted and the five most prevalent types of questions were found to concern the applicant's 1) supervisory experience, 2) rationale for joining Teacher Corps, 3) knowledge of community, 4) supervision strategies, and 5) working condition requirements.

A rough estimate of the weighting of each group's recommendations can be made by adding the recommended and selected percentage to the not-recommended and not-selected percentage. These weightings (Table I) indicate no real differences. The community representatives recommended more people than could be hired, which tended to lower their total weight, and the Teacher Corps administrator group was too small to be reliable (two at first, then one).

Table II: Instructional Consultants Screening Summary

<u>Panel</u>	<u>No. on</u>		<u>Selected</u>		<u>Not Selected</u>		<u>Weighted</u>
	<u>Panel</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.Votes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.Votes</u>	<u>Sum</u>	
Public School							
Personnel	8	100	33	50	11	150	
T. C. Interns	3	85	17	67	8	152	
Community Residents	5	93	29	39	7	132	
T.C. Administrators	2	100	10	67	4	167	
Incumbent I.C.'s	3	95	18	54	6	149	

One-third of the panel left during the course of the screening. Therefore, the panel was not the same for all the applicants. The role of instructional consultant in the Teacher Corps was not fully explained to the panel. There was no objective moderator during the session. The moderator gave glowing introductions of some applicants and just pronounced the names of others. The panel members spent much of their time arguing among themselves on the validity and reliability of posed questions. They were not given an opportunity to discuss their functions and roles privately prior to the actual screening session.

Screening: Interns

Interns were to be screened and selected for pre-service prior to their coming to Pittsburgh.

Each intern who was to work in the Pittsburgh school system was interviewed during the first two weeks of August, 1969 (6th and 7th week of pre-service) by a representative of the School Board. The McKeesport interns were interviewed by Dr. Harry Faulk (Superintendent of McKeesport Area School District) and his staff during the second week of August (7th week of pre-service). No interns were deselected as a result of these processes, although one McKeesport intern was initially rejected. That intern took it upon himself to question the rejection, and was able to show that his rejection was due to a misunderstanding.

McKeesport. The eleven interns who were going to teach were screened by "community representatives" on Wednesday, August 20, 1969. The two pairs of screeners split the interns into two groups (elementary and secondary) and interviewed each group as a unit. At the end of a forty-five minute period the screener pairs changed places to interview the other group of interns.

The interviews themselves appeared more like community orientations than screening processes. As the interviews progressed, it became obvious that the screeners were looking for reactions to various community situations that they were vocalizing. The emphasis of questions directed to the interns was on classroom situations and how the intern would handle them. Questions about the intern's involvement in community affairs outside the school were conspicuous by their absence.

All of the applicants were recommended for employment by this screening panel.

These panels had no program directors, no experienced interns, no instructional consultants, and no representatives of the McKeesport Public School System on them.

Pittsburgh. Thirty-one interns who were going to work in Pittsburgh were screened by "community representatives" on Thursday, August 21, 1969. The eleven screeners represented five inner-city areas in Pittsburgh. The screeners were divided into three groups (each group representing three or four communities) and became three separate panels. Each intern was assigned to one of the three panels and spent approximately fifteen minutes with that panel.

Prior to breaking up into these three panels, the community representatives queried the director as to why each community was not screening those interns coming to its area. The director's response was based on the possibility that an intern might have to transfer during tenure. No mention was made of the fact that many of the interns did not know what schools they were going to yet.

The interviews were very business-like in nature--there was much discussed in the short time periods available. The most frequently discussed topics were intern behavior in the classroom and his reaction to hypothetical classroom atmospheres and settings. This includes those questions which were directed at assessing the intern's potential contribution to black children. Four other topics of concern were the community involvement plans of the interns, the intern's ability to work within the black-white controversy without being a racist, the intern's personal background and the intern's rationale for going into teaching.

One of the applicants was deselected as a result of this process (all panel members indicated they would not recommend the applicant) and a few others were placed on an informal community probation (some of the panel members indicated they would not recommend the intern). The screeners and the director agreed that if everyone on the panel voted no, the applicant was out. If there was lack of unanimity, the applicant was on probation.

These panels had no program directors, no experienced interns, no instructional consultants, and no representatives of the Pittsburgh public school system on them.

The list of selected interns and instructional consultants who participated in the in-service program appears in the Appendix.

Intercultural Training Workshop

This workshop was not held during the first week of pre-service, but was held during the sixth and seventh week-ends. The interns were assigned to one of the two week-ends by the director. One of his criteria for assigning interns was racial balance in both sessions.

Rationale for Using Reactionnaire APPENDIX II

The reactionnaire was developed jointly by the principal investigator and the sensitivity training personnel (trainers). The trainers identified the behavioral changes desired in this type of experience, and the instrument was designed to determine if those changes did occur. The instrument also included items to identify sources of "noise" within each sensitivity group.

These reactionnaires were to be completed by each trainer after every session (four or five sessions during the week-end experiences). This would have allowed identification of changes within groups over the entire week-end, and comparison of behavior across groups. The reactionnaires were not completed by all of the trainers, and those who completed them did not do so for every session.

Procedure for Tabulating Responses to the Reactionnaire

There were 32 separate training sessions rated during the first week and 14 during the second week and so for each item we have 32 ratings the first week and 14 ratings the second week.

Our tabulations have compared the behavior movement from the start of a training session with the behavior at the end of that session. We were not concerned about interim movements during the session.

When no movement was reported by the trainees, or when the final movement ended at the starting point, we tabulated the rating incident as "remained the same."

Below are four examples of typical responses to Items I - VI of the reactionnaire, and the technique used for placing them into one of the three categories: the two extremes (i.e., hostility or friendliness) and "remained the same." All responses fell into these four categories.

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 1. | Hostility | A | | BC | | | | | Friendliness |
| | | (The tendency is toward "friendliness" as shown by the movement from A to BC.) | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 2. | Hostility | | C | | A | | B | | Friendliness |
| | | (The tendency is toward "hostility" as shown by the movement from A to C. B is an interim rating and is <u>not</u> measured by the tabulation.) | | | | | | | |

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Hostility A Friendliness
 (There is no tendency toward hostility nor friendliness.
 This group tended to "remain the same" throughout the
 session.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Hostility AC B Friendliness
 (This group started and ended at the same position as
 measured by AC. There was an intermediate tendency
 toward "friendliness" as shown by B but this is not
 being measured in our tabulations. This item would
 be placed in the "remained the same" category because
 it began and ended in the same position.)

Results of Tabulation

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Week</u>	<u>Week</u>
I	5 hostility 11 friendliness 16 remained the same	3 hostility 1 friendliness 9 remained the same 1 no response
II	4 closed and suspicious 10 open and trusting 18 remained the same	2 closed and suspicious 1 open and trusting 11 remained the same
III	0 dependent upon trainer 8 showed initiative 24 remained the same	1 dependent upon trainer 1 showed initiative 11 remained the same 1 no response
IV	0 past issues 14 present and future issues 18 remained the same	1 past issues 2 present and future issues 11 remained the same
V	3 general problem solving 3 quick and dirty 19 remained the same 7 no response	1 general problem solving 2 quick and dirty 8 remained the same 3 no response
VI	4 feedback utilized 0 feedback not utilized 26 remained the same 2 no response	1 feedback utilized 1 feedback not utilized 11 remained the same 1 no response

Item No.

VII Interns seek assistance primarily from: (check one)

	<u>Week 1</u>	<u>Week 2</u>
Teacher Corps Administrative Staff	9%	-
Community Consultants	40%	76%
Instructional Consultants	9%	-
Other Interns	15%	16%
Trainers	27%	8%

Comment _____

VIII Content of discussions: (check those issues discussed during the time period; place a 1, 2 or 3 by the three most discussed issues)

	<u>Past</u>		<u>Present or Future</u>	
	<u>Week 1</u>	<u>Week 2</u>	<u>Week 1</u>	<u>Week 2</u>
Administrative Problems	1	3		
Black-white Problems	2	1	1	1
Community Problems	3	2	2	3
Individual Problems			3	2
Team Development Problems				
Other (specify _____)				

Comment _____

(The above are based upon weighting the responses 1, 2 and 3 on the reactionnaire.

IX Does your group have goals?

	<u>Week 1</u>	<u>Week 2</u>
Yes	64%	57%
No	36%	43%

If "Yes" whose goals are they?

	<u>Week 1</u>	<u>Week 2</u>
Group's Goals	76%	87%
Trainer's Goals	16%	-
Community consultant's goals	8%	13%
Other (specify)	-	-

Item No.

X What is hindering your group in its progress toward its goals (or setting its goals)?

Week 1: newness 13%, racial difference 10%, time 7%, "noise" 3%
no norms 10%, drop issues too quickly 6%, few interns
in groups 13%, not all present 10%, fear of attack
from others 10%.

Week 2: dominant groups 27%, fear of attack 27%, no communi-
cation 28%, covert reasons 9%, newness 18%

An objective of the sensitivity training sessions was:

". . . to establish an open trusting atmosphere where the participants may verbalize their prejudices, feelings, thinking, especially about racial issues and about teaching."³⁴

Hopefully, at the end of the training sessions the participants could function more as a "united group." But the results of our tabulation indicate that for most of the training sessions individuals did not change and there was little or no growth in unity among the participants at the end. In fact, the differences became more obvious (more so in the second week-end) but little was done toward reshaping the interns into a cohesive unit. The second session (which has not yet occurred) has the explicit purpose of pulling the interns back together.

These team assignments for in-service were not made until late in the pre-service phase. This timing was very unpopular with both the interns and the trainers. The feeling was that it would be advantageous to have functioning teams move into schools rather than having to create a team during the first months of the school year. The intercultural training could have had more meaning to the interns and community consultants if teams going to a particular community were paired with community consultants from that area.

Another confounding factor was that no screening or selection had taken place prior to the workshops. This led many interns to assume that they would be screened during the workshop sessions. This was a major consideration in the decision of the evaluation staff to not observe the workshop in person.

Curriculum

The reading seminars held in the summer were overviews of reading problems that elementary and secondary teachers would find in their classrooms. They were not designed to impart reading teaching skills. The lack of congruity between course content and the interns' expectations may have contributed to the high absentee percentage reported by the reading instructor.

The mathematics seminars held in the summer were designed to teach mathematics teaching skills. The participation in this course was "most encouraging" to the instructor, and interns felt it was more relevant than the others.

The course on community, although designed to utilize varied community resources, was not conducted in that manner. The classes divided themselves into sub-communities and were given tasks to perform which involved interaction between the artificial communities. Each task and the community solutions were discussed within the class. Twenty percent of the secondary interns and an undetermined fraction of the elementary interns found the course "irrelevant" and did not return after the first meeting.

The student teaching seminar was utilized for other purposes than intended at various times. One session was devoted to the instructional consultants' efforts to define their roles (with the assistance of the interns). Another was devoted to discussions with staff members from the Washington office of Teacher Corps concerning policies and responsibilities. An effort was made in the last week to include those aspects of teacher education which had been stated in the proposal, but not presented in the seminar. This effort was ineffective due to the low attendance of the interns during the last week of pre-service. Less than 60% of the interns attended class, although all reappeared on Thursday for their community screening.

Management Problems

The lack of concrete role definitions for the administrative staff and the instructional consultants has deterred efforts to answer the question: "Who is supposed to do what to what end?" With respect to roles, particularly those related to welding the inexperienced interns and untried I.C.'s into a successful, cohesive, competent team to deal with the city's most difficult educational problems, the following factors were management problems of concern in the pre-service phase:

1. The director was not appointed until July 1, 1969 and he was away from Pittsburgh for four of the first six weeks of pre-service.

2. One associate director (Instruction) did not arrive until the first week of pre-service -- July 1, 1969.
3. One associate director (Community) did not arrive during pre-service, and he was not a resident of the community prior to his appointment September 1, 1969.
4. The Teacher Corps counselor was away three weeks, on special assignment for ten days, and was reported ill for most of the remainder of the summer.
5. Five instructional consultants went to Temple for three of the first four weeks of pre-service. Two of those who remained in the city had such heavy course loads that they had to be away from their schools during the time the interns were teaching, and one I.C. did not arrive until the end of pre-service.
6. The one-week staff planning and orientation (including an Instructional Consultant Workshop) did not occur.

When the interns were supposed to enter the schools to begin their pre-service student teaching, the Pittsburgh Public Schools did not have places for them, and when they did select some schools for the program, they selected one school whose principal was diametrically opposed to Teacher Corps concepts. He would not allow the instructional consultant to supervise interns in his building. The reaction of teachers in their schools to the interns was a function of the principal's reaction rather than intern behavior.

The pre-service teaching experiences were not as broad as envisioned by the proposal due to the different summer schools in which the interns were participating (public and Catholic). Some were in tutorial programs, others in accelerated classes, and still others in remedial classes. Only a few instructional consultants were able to set up the necessary range of experience envisioned by the proposal for each intern. The community experience of the interns was limited. The fact that they did not know where they would be assigned during in-service worked against any realistic possibility to get to know a community.

During the contract preparation stage, there were only two instructional consultants available to help the interns prepare their schedules, and these two instructional consultants joined the program in mid-summer.

The absence of some management personnel and the highly individualistic attitudes of some of the interns combined to produce an operation which lacked resemblance to the original proposal. The assumption was apparently made that all interns would willingly participate in pre-service program activities. This assumption did not prove to be correct, and little effective effort was made to cope with the non-participation problem. This led to more attempts to control the whole program by groups of interns.

IV. SUMMARY

This report began with a review of the 4th Cycle proposal, giving particular emphasis to the sections of the proposal describing proposal objectives, how they were to be accomplished, and by whom. Sections which related to the pre-service period were also reviewed. This provided a background of understanding of what was desired and attempted in the 4th Cycle program.

Desires are not accomplishments, and certainly, with respect to the pre-service session, the Teacher Corps did not always accomplish what it set out to do. The evaluators looked at the procedures and products in light of the stated objectives, but they did not give priority to an explanation and understanding of the context. It must be understood that the Teacher Corps is a highly experimental program, trying to fill a number of needs, in an environment which is often alien and sometimes hostile. The summer of 1969--the period described in this report--was a particularly difficult time because of a high level (if not the high point) of administrative instability, institutional turmoil and other effects of racism and alienation in the very institutions (school, university, community) the Teacher Corps was trying to affect. The change agent's job is never an easy one under the best of circumstances, and the summer of 1969 may have been the worst of circumstances. A detailed description of the context will be part of the subsequent full-year report.

A useful evaluation must have recommendations for improvement. These recommendations have been made during program operation, and are now made in writing. Every program can be improved. Recommending improvements is the business of evaluators and does not imply adverse criticism. Often decisions made were the most reasonable, or even the only feasible ones open at the time of decision-making. The purpose of evaluation is to help the program in the future to avoid being condemned by decisions of the past which now appear to have been poor alternatives.

The recommendations have been put at the front of the report for those who do not wish to wade through the whole report looking for recommendations.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) National Teacher Corps-Guidelines, (Washington D.C.: -U.S.Gov't Printing Office, 1966), p.1.
- (2) Futures in Education: Teacher Corps, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Gov't Printing Office, 1969), p.1.
- (3) James B. Wilson, Rationale and Design for the Practicum Experiences in an Internship for Instructional Consultants (doctoral dissertation: University of Pittsburgh, 1968).
- (4) David W. Champagne, Rationale and Design of the University Phase of an Internship for Instructional Consultants (doctoral dissertation: University of Pittsburgh, 1968).
- (5) A PROPOSAL FOR TEACHER CORPS-URBAN INTERNSHIP IN PITTSBURGH AND MCKEESPORT, 1969-71, submitted by the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Public Schools, and the McKeesport Public Schools on January 3, 1969.
- (6) Ibid, sec II, p.3.
- (7) Ibid, sec III, p.1.
- (8) Ibid, sec III, p.2.
- (9) Ibid, sec III, pp. 2-3.
- (10) Ibid, sec III, pp. 4-5.
- (11) Ibid, sec X, p.1.
- (12) Ibid, sec X, p.2.
- (13) Ibid, sec X, pp. 2-3.
- (14) Ibid, sec X, p.4.
- (15) Ibid, sec X, p.4.
- (16) Ibid, sec X, p.4.
- (17) Ibid, sec X, p.5. For a more detailed explanation of the hopes for student teaching experiences during the pre-service session-See section X of the proposal.
- (18) Ibid, sec X, p.5.
- (19) Ibid, sec X, p.6.

- (20) Ibid, sec X, p.7.
- (21) Ibid, sec X, p.7.
- (22) Ibid, sec X, p.8.
- (23) Ibid, sec X, p. 8-9.
- (24) Ibid, sec X, p.9.
- (25) Ibid, sec XIV, p 2-3.
- (26) Ibid, sec XV, p.1.
- (27) Ibid, sec. XV, p.2.
- (28) Ibid, sec. XV, p. 2-3.
- (29) Ibid, sec XV, p.3.
- (30) Ibid, sec XV, p.4.
- (31) Ibid, sec X, p. 1.
- (32) Ibid, sec III, p. 2.
- (33) Ibid, sec XV, p. 3.
- (34) Ibid, sec X, p. 3.

ED0 47018

TM 000 405

Appendix I

INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTANT CHECKLIST (for trial and comment)

Date _____

Intern _____ Instructional Consultant _____

Instructions: A. Enter one check per item.
 B. Use the interns' behavior for the last month as a basis for your responses.

1. Recognizable Basic Teaching Technique: None ___ One ___ Two ___ More than two ___

	Never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
2. Is prepared for classroom learning difficulties (has anticipated them)				
3. Mode of teaching is appropriate to students				
4. Uses conflicting verbal and non-verbal signals in the classroom				
5. Classroom learning sequences:				
a) planned prior to class				
b) planned for more than one day at a time				
c) related to daily objectives				
6. Uses appropriate and acceptable management techniques to cope with disruptive behavior				
7. Reinforces classroom task behavior				
8. Ignores and/or quietly stops off-task behavior				
9. Anticipates disruptive behavior				
10. Perceived by students as adult (rather than peer)				
11. Books, films, dittos, etc. (which intern prepares or chooses)				
a) appropriate to classroom objectives				
b) ready when necessary				
12. Uses community knowledge in the classroom (learning activities are relevant to students' environment)				

	Never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
13. Recognizes communication difficulties when they occur (message sent is not congruent with message received)				
a) student-student				
b) intern-student				
c) intern-intern				
d) intern-instructional consultant				
e) intern-regular school staff				
f) intern-community member				
14. All students participate in daily classroom activities				
15. Loses portions of the class in unproductive behavior				
16. Intern's students attend to those participating in the classroom activities while they are not actively participating in those activities				
17. Students begin class activities on cue from intern				
18. a) Exhibits defensive behavior in relations with instructional consultants and supervisors.				
b) Supplies alternative solutions when rejecting the suggestion of an instructional consultant or supervisor.				
19. Feels a sense of fulfillment in his Teacher Corps activities (getting somewhere or accomplishing something)				
20. a) Is involved in a community project.				
b) Knowledge of community				

Comments: _____

ED047019

TK1

APPENDIX II

Group D - Broskowski

49

Circle one

I II III IV V

Circle one and enter date

Fri. X Sat. ___ Sun. ___

In items 1 to 6 use the letters A, B, C, etc. to show the position of your group on this item and changes noted during the time period.

For example:

a) Mood: Happy ___ A ___ C ___ B Sad

This response would indicate that the session began in a very happy mood, changed during the session to an extremely sad mood, and ended in a neutral mood.

b) Mood: Happy ___ ___ ___ A ___ ___ Sad

This response would indicate that the whole session was held in a somewhat sad mood, no change taking place during the time period.

Use the comment space to list the factors which contributed to the changes noted (or the lack of change).

1. Atmosphere within the group

Hostility ___ A ___ B ___ C ___ FriendlinessComment: Some members angry about "having to be sensitized"

No overt anger - subtle sarcasm - superficially
not confronting one another - vague angry reactions
because the "group" wasn't doing "anything relevant"

2. Group members relations with the group

Open and Trusting ___ B C A ~~B~~ ___ Closed and suspicious

Comment: Members didn't want to express themselves &
open up - gradually realized they need to know each
other better as individuals and then gradually began to
try ways to do it - (e.g. pair off in turns)

3. The group (as a whole)

showed initiative, ___ C ___ B ___ ~~A~~ A was dependent upon the train
 were innovative, ___

TM 000 406

Suggest

page 2

Comment: Members began to express selves more
when they saw "Leader" wasn't going to lead

4. The group dealt with

Past issues A
 (what we tried
 to do)

B Present and Future
 issues (what we need or
 want to do)

Comment: After short disc. of old T.C. problems
they began to focus (after leaders' comments) on
personal issues in the here and now

5. The group concentrated on

general problem
 solving discussion

BA

seeking "quick and
 dirty" solutions
 (prescriptions)

Comments: Some asked for prescription - others also tried
to translate each person's personal comments into prescriptions -
Community person (██████) resisted this - "group" decided they'd
have to "know where I'm at" - feel confident as a person - think rejection

6. The feed back provided by group members

was not
 utilized

AB

was utilized

Comment: Feedback criteria weren't distributed yet
Feedback which was given was utilized temporarily -
the group began to use all styles

page 3

7. Interns seek assistance primarily from: (check one)

- ☐ Teacher Corps Administrative Staff
☐ Community Consultants *In beginning*
☐ Instructional Consultants
☐ Other Interns (*in end of session*)
☐ Trainers (*In middle*)

Comment: _____

5. Content of discussions: (check those issues discussed during the time period, place a 1, 2, and 3 by the three most discussed issues)

Past

Present or Future

1

Administrative problems

3

Black-white problems

21

Individual Problems

23

Team Development problems

2Other (specify discrimination)

Other (specify _____)

Comment: _____

Almost all there were discussed except
 the B-W problem which was relatively not
 put down by C.C. as not basic (i.e. the B-W, not-fund, not-prob)

9. Does your group have goals?

X

no

no

? get to know
 each other better

If yes, what goals are they?

Both

group

sessions

_____ community consultant

_____ other (specify) _____

Comment:

^{initial}
 It's the ^{initial} goal I, as leader, had from beginning which I soon revealed + group gradually came to see as a necessary beginning

10. What is hindering your group in its progress toward its goals (or in setting its goals)?

A few interns who feel they don't need the sessions + already are prepared - and are disrupting sessions (e.g. turning on T.V. set to watch ballgame - getting attention)

11. Are all members of the group participating equally? _____ yes, ☒ no

Those who dominate discussion

Those who don't enter discussion

Name	Role	Name	Role
[redacted]	Intern	[redacted]	Intern
[redacted]	Trainer	[redacted]	C.C.
[redacted]	C.C.		
[redacted]	Admin.		

Comment:

Everyone said something but two in right column above are intentionally quiet - Most share common.

page 5

12. Obvious participant sub-groupings during this time period

Name	Role	Name	Role	Name	Role
7. [redacted]	Int.	[redacted]	Int	[redacted]	
8. [redacted]	D.C.	[redacted]	Int (ch. 10)	[redacted]	Intern

Descriptor

Critics

Descriptor

Teambuilders

Descriptor

Intimators (lets get to know each other)

Can you give the groups a name (descriptor) to allow someone else to identify the group (black, white, left, right, etc)

Comment:

13. Other issues or "happenings" which you feel are important to understanding your group and its personality during this time period (ie. members missing etc).

Some didn't show { [redacted] }

[redacted] turning on T.V. set turned group
 & here & now & personal reactions
 to one another

Appendix III

INTERNS WHO ATTENDED THE PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM

JUNE 25 - AUG. 31, 1970

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Agostinelli, David J. | 27. * Mulvey, Thomas P. |
| 2. Alston, Lucille L. | 28. Murno, Anne-Marie |
| 3. Bailey, Fred A. | 29. Michael, Beverly K. |
| 4.* Bailey, Mila S. | 30. Mulcahey, George R. |
| 5. Barker, John E. | 31. Newring, Brenda V. |
| 6. Barner, Timothy C. | 32. Patrick, James G. |
| 7. Chylinski, Stephen Jr. | 33. Polonus, Ann |
| 8.* Conroy, Daniel P. | 34. Powell, Thomas W. |
| 9. Corbett, Margaret | 35. Rawlings, William L. |
| 10. Davis, Lawrence E. | 36. Rue, Valerie A. |
| 11. Ehrlich, Lawrence M. | 37. Salada, Gary D. |
| 12.* Freeman, Michael | 38. Scarfino, Frank A. |
| 13. Fregly, Francis D. | 39. Scott, Harry W. |
| 14. Green, Candace P. | 40. * Sheehan, Kevin J. |
| 15.* Gilbert, Rose Ann | 41. Siegal, Toni Y. |
| 16. Guadagni, Louis R. | 42. Smith, Velerie D. |
| 17. Hayes, Colette | 43. Snauffer, Gloria F. |
| 18. Hayes, Frederick D. | 44. Stewart, Sally P. |
| 19. Houchins, Francis K. | 45. Strotzman, Raymond O. |
| 20. Hyde, Mary I. | 46. Tipton, Vernon |
| 21.* Kaiserman, Howard M. | 47. Whatley, Arthur L. |
| 22. Klingensmith, Nancy | 48. Whisler, John R. |
| 23.*McCain, LaVerne L. | 49. Wingard, Levi. |
| 24. Mahan, Brian J. | 50. Williams, Robert E. |
| 25. Moore, Alyson | 51. Wooten, Carl K. |
| 26.* Morris, Noelle J. | |

* Interns who left Teacher Corps during or at the end of the pre-service session.

Interns in pre-service session.....	51
Interns who left (*).....	9

Interns who started in-service session	
September 1, 1969	42

Of those who left during the summer pre-service session, one was involuntarily deselected; one left for personal reasons, three accepted regular teaching positions, and four left because of some inability or unwillingness to cope with the teaching situations presented or projected.

Interns entered at various times during the pre-service program, but most entered at or near the beginning, June 25, 1970.

Appendix IV

INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTANTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM

1. Clifford Bayliss, Jr.*
2. Ray Bowman
3. Frederick Harris
4. Thomas Meade*
5. John Morgan
6. Jon Nelson*
7. Marvin Scott*
8. John Stanier

*Resigned or were promoted after the pre-service program.

To replace those instructional consultants who either resigned or were promoted, the following instructional consultants were hired:

John Leftwich	-	December, 1969
Ernest O'Neil	-	September, 1969
Henry C. Harper	-	September, 1969
Dorothy Williams	-	September, 1969

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF WHO SERVED TEACHER CORPS DURING THE PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1. Marion L. Poole	Director
2. Eugene A. Lincoln	Associate Director
3. David W. Champagne	Associate Director
4. Herman Herring	Associate Director for Community Affairs
5. Lowell Jackson	Assistant to the Associate Director for Community Affairs
6. Carolyn Howe	Community Assistant
7. Charles B. Watkins	SEA Coordinator (Teacher Corps-Board of Education)
8. Dorothy Hendricks	Counselor
9. James Mauch	Research Director
10. Thomas Perkinson	Educational Media Consultant
11. Marcellene Wingard	Senior Secretary
12. Maria Hendfield	Secretary
13. Dave McCann	Evaluator

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Proposal for Teacher Corps - Urban Internship in Pittsburgh and McKeesport, 1969-71 submitted by the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Public Schools and the McKeesport Public Schools on January 3, 1969.
2. Arth, Alfred A. and Wagoner, Jennings L. "Teacher Corp Interns; A Different Breed." Education Leader, May, 1969, pp.801-805.
3. Champagne, David W. Rationale and Design of the University Phase of an Internship for Instructional Consultants. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Pittsburgh, 1968.
4. Douty, Harriet. "Learning to Teach the Disadvantaged." New Republic. Vol 158: June 29, 1969, pp. 14-15.
5. Futures in Education: Teacher Corps. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office, 1969.
6. Goldman, Harvey. Who Joins the Teacher Corps? Office of Education Grant: No. 3-6-590502-2170: Madison: University of Wisconsin.
7. Graham, Richard A. "Educational Change and the Teacher Corps" Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1970, pp 305-309.
8. Kampton, Murray. "Proclaim and Abandon - The Life and Hard Times of the Teacher Corps" Washington Monthly, Vol I. No.1 February, 1969.
9. Missionaries in the Classroom. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office, 1967.
10. National Teacher Corps - Guidelines. National Teacher Corps Office, Washington, D.C. Gov't Printing Office, 1966.
11. Teacher Corps: Two Years of Progress and Plans for the Future. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Washington School of Psychiatry, Oct.25, 1968.
12. Teacher Corps: A New Dimension in Education. ed. W. J. Kennedy and Robert E. Smith. Houston: Bureau of Education Research and Service, University of Houston, 1969.
13. The National Teacher Corps. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office, 1968.
14. Wilson, James P. Rationale and Design for the University Experiment in an Internship for Instructional Consultants. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968.
15. Your Child and the Teacher Corps. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office, 1971.